

CARL T. ROWAN

The Need to Ease Tensions With Soviet Bloc

Sen. William Westmoreland's home front lecture tour had the intended effect of consolidating support for the United States Vietnam policy. This will ease some of President Johnson's woes for a while. But the Vietnam commander's performance also produced reactions that may haunt Mr. Johnson for a long time. Westmoreland inspired the super-hawks to fresh new cries for escalation of what they call "a win policy."

"They want a military effort unrestrained by what some conservatives call an administration 'preoccupation' with building bridges of peace between the United States and the Soviet Union."

Westmoreland's speech infused vigor into those who seem to think the United States can win the world through application of our vast military power — and who are now waging new attacks on the consular treaty and the airlines agreement with Russia.

Once again visions of huge new consulates and vast jetliners, all full of Soviet spies, are being put before the

American public.

This may or may not be one reason why Sen. Thruston Morton, R., Ky., conceded in a recent speech that the East-West Trade Bill is dead for this session of Congress.

Those who wish the United States to adopt policies that flow from a hard and uncompromising attitude toward every Communist country can't possibly understand the deeper meaning of the defection of Joe Stalin's daughter to the United States.

When Mrs. Svetlana Alliluyeva left her children in Russia to seek asylum in the West, it said something about the human heart, mind and soul that ought not to be overlooked by any true believer in democracy and its respect for the individual personality.

Surely not many Americans think that this charming, articulate daughter of a dead Soviet tyrant is the only Russian who knows that "men do not live by bread alone," who yearns for freedom to worship, the right to dissent, or an actual voice in selecting those who govern.

Eight years ago Alexander

Kaznacheev, a young Soviet Embassy official in Rangoon, Burma, sought refuge in the embassy of the United States which he called "the leader of the free world's struggle against communism."

Then there were Mrs. Nina Dmitriev and her small daughter seeking refuge in Britain in 1959, and Rudolph Nureyev of the Russian Bolshoi Ballet seeking asylum in 1961, and two Bolshoi musicians, Igor Berechitis and Boris Midney. . . .

They were yielding to the same human hopes and aspirations that motivated Stalin's daughter.

Top officials of a dozen Western countries used to gossip about the visits of Alexei Adzhubei, son-in-law of former Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev. On his goodwill jaunts, Adzhubei inevitably would have a few snorts of vodka and launch a monologue about life in the United States.

He would throw in enough castigations of the United States to disabuse most listeners of any notions that our Central Intelligence Agency had bought him, but few people failed to see that

Adzhubei admired much that was American.

When he talked of the "freedoms" of the average American, the young Russian was moving — so much so that many a European worried that he might talk himself into trouble back home.

There is no evidence that Adzhubei's candid soliloquies had anything to do with Khrushchev's ouster. But I saw much during my last visit to the Soviet Union, and I have seen and heard much since, to convince me that the United States cannot lose from the greater contacts that will accrue from the easing of tensions with the Communist bloc.

Obviously, some Americans doubt that a normalization of relations with the Communist countries will result in their entire societies moving in the direction that Stalin's daughter moved. But if they cannot believe this, they can have no real hope that democracy will prevail over the long haul. Not even Westmoreland's wildly applauded performance could really have convinced anyone that we can triumph through military might alone.